APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/716,944	11/18/2003	L. Keith Lipman	INWO0053	7265

22862   7590   06/01/2009
GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER
TRUONG, CAM Y T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2169	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/01/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/716,944	LIPMAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cam Y T. Truong	2169	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 March 2009*.
2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant has amended claims 1 and 16 in the amendment filed on 3/23/2009.

Claims 1-18 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 3/23/2009 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

a.   Applicant argued that Arcuri has nothing to do with saved queries or

associating one or more save queries with documents and folders.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Arcuri teaches one query is directed to all

documents that stored in folders (col. 9, lines 30-37). Documents are checked against a

query (col. 11, lines 45-67; col. 12, lines 1-10). The documents are stored in folders (col.

5, lines 53-62). The properties values set is saved and associated with documents and

folders(col. 7, lines 20-40; col. 8, lines 1-35). The above information shows that queries

or the properties values sets are associated with documents and folders.

In addition, Panichkul teaches searching a memory to retrieve a stored search

query in the memory (figs. 1 &4, col. 8, lines 15-55). Storing search queries in a

memory and re-running a saved query based on user selection (col. 8, lines 15-55).

Memory is represented as a master file.

As discussed above, the combination of references teaches the above claimed

limitations.

b. Applicant argued that the combination of references does not teach all of claimed limitation of claims 1 and 16.

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

In particularly, as to claim 1, Acuri teaches the claimed limitations:

" a processor programmed for setting up a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a document type" as a computer programmed for creating a plurality of document library file system folders 68.sub.1 -68.sub.M, wherein each document library file system folder 68 is a folder on the file system 36 in which content of a specified type may be read and saved. The document library file system folder 68 may include subfolders. For example, one document library file system folder 68 may contain a certain department's written specifications, another may contain the department's published whitepapers, another may contain the department's schedules, and so forth. Subfolders may be present, e.g., the department's schedules may be contained in different subfolders of the same document library file system folder 68 (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 1, col. 5, lines 58-67; col. 6, lines 1-10);

" processor programmed for automatically creating metadata data fields for a new document" as a computer programmed for creating properties fields for documents (figs. 1&3, col. 4, lines 23-40). The properties form 82 includes fields, e.g. the fields 83, 84, 86, each of which represents one of the properties in the property set for the respective document library. A properties form may be designed so that some property fields are mandatory (e.g., require data), while others may be optional. The

completed fields define the properties values of the respective document (col. 6, lines

52-65), the properties fields in form 82 are presented as metadata fields,

"when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata fields

appropriate for the document type" as each document library preferably has its own set

of properties. The properties are preferably any type of meta-information that may be

associated with a document, e.g., meta-information such as state of a document,

expire-time, work-flow assignment, arbitrary groupings made by disjoint collections of

documents, and the like. The set of properties for the document library are relevant to

the type of documents it contains. Each document in a document library may have no

value or a valid value for each of the properties in its containing document library's

property set. The values for each of the properties for a particular document make up

the document's properties values set 71. Only one properties values set 71 is shown

in FIG. 2, but each document preferably includes its own properties value set. As is

described further below, to facilitate searching and categorization, it is better that

each document in a document library have values set meaningfully. The properties

values set 71 for a document is preferably maintained with other document metadata,

but may be associated with the document in another manner. For example, if the

document library contains documents related to motor specifications for a brand of

cars, the properties for that document library may include the motor type, the author of

the specification, the years in which the motor was sold, the displacement of the

engine, and the like (col. 6, lines 9-34). The above information shows that a document

is saved in a folder, the properties fields for the document type.

"wherein saved queries are associable with documents and folders" as one query is directed to all documents that stored in folders (fig. 5, col. 9, lines 30-37). Documents are checked against a query (fig. 10, col. 11, lines 45-67; col. 12, lines 1-10). The documents are stored in folders (col. 5, lines 53-62). The properties values set is saved and associated with documents and folders(col. 7, lines 20-40; col. 8, lines 1-35). The above information shows that queries or the properties values sets are associated with documents and folders.

Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for searching said master file, wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and saved queries".

Panichkul teaches searching a memory to retrieve a stored search query in the memory (figs. 1 &4, col. 8, lines 15-55). Storing search queries in a memory and re-running a saved query based on user selection (col. 8, lines 15-55). Memory is represented as a master file

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Panichkur's teaching of retrieving a stored search query from a memory, storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved query based on user selection to Acuri 's system in order to improve the overall quality of search result set, reduce the burden of maintaining and tracking persistent queries, and further increase the overall speed of the search process.

As to claim 16, Acuri teaches the claimed limitations:

"a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a

document type" as a computer programmed for creating a plurality of document library

file system folders 68.sub.1 -68.sub.M, wherein each document library file system folder

68 is a folder on the file system 36 in which content of a specified type may be read and

saved. The document library file system folder 68 may include subfolders. For

example, one document library file system folder 68 may contain a certain department's

written specifications, another may contain the department's published whitepapers,

another may contain the department's schedules, and so forth. Subfolders may be

present, e.g., the department's schedules may be contained in different subfolders of

the same document library file system folder 68 (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 1, col. 5,

lines 58-67; col. 6, lines 1-10);

" the matter file including the plurality of folders" as a computer programmed for

creating a plurality of document library file system folders 68.sub.1 -68.sub.M, wherein

each document library file system folder 68 is a folder on the file system 36 in which

content of a specified type may be read and saved. The document library file system

folder 68 may include subfolders. For example, one document library file system folder

68 may contain a certain department's written specifications, another may contain the

department's published whitepapers, another may contain the department's schedules,

and so forth. Subfolders may be present, e.g., the department's schedules may be

contained in different subfolders of the same document library file system folder 68 (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 1, col. 5, lines 58-67; col. 6, lines 1-10);

"automatically creating metadata data fields for a new document filed in one of the plurality of folders in the matter file, the metadata fields appropriate for the document type" as a computer programmed for creating properties fields for documents (figs. 1&3, col. 4, lines 23-40). The properties form 82 includes fields, e.g. the fields 83, 84, 86, each of which represents one of the properties in the property set for the respective document library. A properties form may be designed so that some property fields are mandatory (e.g., require data), while others may be optional. The completed fields define the properties values of the respective document (col. 6, lines 52-65), the properties fields in form 82 are presented as metadata fields;

"wherein saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders" as as one query is directed to all documents that stored in folders (fig. 5, col. 9, lines 30-37). Documents are checked against a query (fig. 10, col. 11, lines 45-67; col. 12, lines 1-10). The documents are stored in folders (col. 5, lines 53-62). The properties values set is saved and associated with documents and folders(col. 7, lines 20-40; col. 8, lines 1-35). The above information shows that queries or the properties values sets are associated with documents and folders.

Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation " setting up a matter file in response to a user request; having a plurality of templates, each template designed to set up; saving user-formulated search queries to said matter file, wherein said saved

queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and saved queries".

Panichkul teaches "saving user-formulated search queries to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein saved queries" as storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved query based on user selection (col. 8, lines 15-55).

Hornick teaches "setting up a matter file in response to a user request; having a plurality of templates, each template designed to set up" as library templates, each template designed to set up a file or folder (paragraphs [0106-0107], figs. 9-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hornick's teaching library templates, each template designed to set up a file and Panichkul teaching of storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved query based on user selection to Acuri's system in order to a user to create folder structures for association with a deal, a schedule of at least one meeting relating to a deal, and minutes from each meeting in order so that a user can search/retrieve information in folders easily and quickly and to improve the overall quality of search result set, reduce the burden of maintaining and tracking persistent queries, and further increase the overall speed of the search process (col. 4, lines 1-30).

As discussed above, Examiner believed that the cited prior arts are

considered as proper prior arts and the rejections for claims 1-18 of the last office

action is proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Acuri (US 6915299) in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul")

(US 6775537).

As to claim 1, Acuri teaches the claimed limitations:

" a processor programmed for setting up a matter file including a plurality of

folders, each folder corresponding to a document type" as a computer programmed for

creating a plurality of document library file system folders 68.sub.1 -68.sub.M, wherein

each document library file system folder 68 is a folder on the file system 36 in which

content of a specified type may be read and saved. The document library file system

folder 68 may include subfolders. For example, one document library file system folder

68 may contain a certain department's written specifications, another may contain the

department's published whitepapers, another may contain the department's schedules,

and so forth. Subfolders may be present, e.g., the department's schedules may be

contained in different subfolders of the same document library file system folder 68

(fig. 1, col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 1, col. 5, lines 58-67; col. 6, lines 1-10);

" processor programmed for automatically creating metadata data fields

for a new document" as a computer programmed for creating properties fields for

documents (figs. 1&3, col. 4, lines 23-40). The properties form 82 includes fields, e.g.

the fields 83, 84, 86, each of which represents one of the properties in the property set

for the respective document library. A properties form may be designed so that some

property fields are mandatory (e.g., require data), while others may be optional. The

completed fields define the properties values of the respective document (col. 6, lines

52-65), the properties fields in form 82 are presented as metadata fields,

"when the new document is placed in a folder, the metadata data fields

appropriate for the document type" as each document library preferably has its own set

of properties. The properties are preferably any type of meta-information that may be

associated with a document, e.g., meta-information such as state of a document,

expire-time, work-flow assignment, arbitrary groupings made by disjoint collections of

documents, and the like. The set of properties for the document library are relevant to

the type of documents it contains. Each document in a document library may have no

value or a valid value for each of the properties in its containing document library's

property set. The values for each of the properties for a particular document make up

the document's properties values set 71. Only one properties values set 71 is shown

in FIG. 2, but each document preferably includes its own properties value set. As is

described further below, to facilitate searching and categorization, it is better that

each document in a document library have values set meaningfully. The properties

values set 71 for a document is preferably maintained with other document metadata,

but may be associated with the document in another manner. For example, if the

document library contains documents related to motor specifications for a brand of

cars, the properties for that document library may include the motor type, the author of

the specification, the years in which the motor was sold, the displacement of the

engine, and the like (col. 6, lines 9-34).

The above information shows that a document is saved in a folder, the properties

fields for the document type,

"wherein saved queries are associable with documents and folders" as one query

is directed to all documents that stored in folders (fig. 5, col. 9, lines 30-37). Documents

are checked against a query (fig. 10, col. 11, lines 45-67; col. 12, lines 1-10). The

documents are stored in folders (col. 5, lines 53-62). The properties values set is saved

and associated with documents and folders(col. 7, lines 20-40; col. 8, lines 1-35). The

above information shows that queries or the properties values sets are associated with

documents and folders.

Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a processor programmed

for searching said master file, wherein user-formulated queries are saved to said matter

file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by

selecting a query and saved queries".

Panichkul teaches searching a memory to retrieve a stored search query in the

memory (figs. 1 &4, col. 8, lines 15-55). Storing search queries in a memory and re-

running a saved query based on user selection (col. 8, lines 15-55). Memory is

represented as a master file

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Panichkur's teaching of retrieving a stored search

query from a memory, storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved query

based on user selection to Acuri 's system in order to improve the overall quality of

search result set, reduce the burden of maintaining and tracking persistent queries, and

further increase the overall speed of the search process.

As to claim 2, Acuri teaches the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for

copying metadata to automatically fill in the metadata data fields which correspond to

metadata fields in a parent folder" as (col. 2, lines 40-55).

7. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri in view

of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view of

Hornick (US 20020103689).

As to claim 3, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a processor

programmed for assigning a security level to the document, the security level

corresponding to a security level of a parent folder". Hornick teaches security level

corresponding to a security level of a folder (paragraph 0086).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Hornick's teaching of security level corresponding to a

security level of folder to Kitamura's system in order to protect folder from modifying

folder without permission.

8. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri

in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US 6775537) and further in view

of Linsey et al (or hereinafter "Linsey") (US 7127676).

As to claim 4, Acuri teaches the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for

creating a new matter folder" as (fig. 11), "creating a plurality of folders within the new

matter folder, each folder corresponding to a document type" as (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 23-

40; col. 1, col. 5, lines 58-67; col. 6, lines 1-10).

Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation " wherein creating said new

master folder comprise receiving a matter type selection from a user". Linsey teaches

creating a folder based on a user selection of a folder type (col. 12, lines 55-67; col. 13,

lines 1-10).

It would have been. obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Linsey's teaching of creating a folder based on a user

selections of a folder type to Acuri's system in order to allow a user to choice a

correct folder type for storing a corresponding document type correctly.

9. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri

in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in

view of Linsey and Huang (US 6571245).

As to claim 5, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation teaches

the claimed limitation "creating said new master folder further comprises: receiving a

list of users for the new matter folder, and adding the new matter folder to a My Matters

folder for the list of users". Huang teaches adding folders to another folder (col. 8, lines

55-67; col. 9, lines

1-5).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Huang's teaching of adding folders to another folder to

Acuri's system in order to update the information in folder quickly.

10. Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Acuri in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and

further in view of Linsey and Robertson (US 6269369).

As to claim 6, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "generating an

email address for the matter folder, the email address to receive emails and filling them

in a correspondence folder in the matter, folder". Robertson teaches creating an email

address for a database, the email address to receive emails and file (fig. 10, col. 8, lines

10-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of creating an email address for

a database, the email address to receives emails and file to of Acuri's system to

allow a user to communicate with other by using the email.

As to claim 7, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a

display address closely related to a matter folder name; and an actual address

corresponding to the display address, the actual address being a unique string".

Robertson teaches displaying an email address as a unique string (col. 8, lines

57-67).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Robertson's teaching of displaying an email address

as a unique string to Acuri's system in order to prevent unauthorized user to

access a user's address book without permission.

11. Claims 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Acuri in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US 6775537) and further in

view of Barnett (US 6369840).

As to claim 8, Acuri does not explicitly teach " a processor programmed for

enabling a user to subscribe a matter file, the subscription putting a copy of a matter file

in the user's My Matters list".

Barnett teaches the user can select individual event categories and/or subdivisions for display in Favorite Events pages 313-315. Selecting an event category in this manner is referred to as "subscribing" to the event category. Favorite Events pages 313-315 display selected events in either a Day View 313, a Week View 314, or a Month View 315. Pages 313-315 allow a user to select individual events from the selected categories, to be added to the personal calendar. The user can also access an Edit Favorites page 316 which allows him or her to add or remove categories and/or subdivisions from display in favorite Events pages 313-315 (col. 8, lines 30-40).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching to Acuri 's system in order to update a user profile or file.

As to claim 10, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations "wherein said user is enabled to subscribe to another user's subscription list and wherein the user may be granted rights to modify another user's subscription list".

Barnett teaches a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be specified for different member members of the group (col. 2, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the ad at the time the invention was made to apply Barnett's teaching of a user can set up a group calendar, specifying the members in the group, where every group member can

access the calendar and make changes to it. Different levels of access can be

specified for different member members of the group to Acuri 's system in order to

allow a user to share selected calendar information with other users of a group in a

security level access.

12. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri

in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and further in view

of Barnett and further in view of Robertson (US 6269369).

As to claim 9, Acuri teaches the claimed limitation wherein the subscription

includes the matter file and documents and other folders" as (col. 8, lines 35-55).

Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein said user is

enabled to subscribe to a matter file at a second level". Robertson teaches modify

record and put the modified record in a user record (col. 3, lines 10-20).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Roberson's teaching to Acuri 's system in order to

share information of a user to another user.

13. Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Acuri in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkur') (US 6775537) and

further in view of Rothkop (Us 2002/0049727).

As to claim 11, Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for filling emails in an appropriate matter file". Rothkop teaches field 740 provides the option of sending a copy of the email to another party. In field 745, the user types in a question or comment for the expert. The user sends the email by clicking on a button 750 (fig. 7, paragraph [0097]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Rothkop's teaching to Acuri 's system in order to exchange messages among users via Internet.

As to claim 12, Acuri teaches the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for prompting a user to send a copy of an email to the matter folder". Rothkop teaches field 740 provides the option of sending a copy of the email to another party. In field 745, the user types in a question or comment for the expert. The user sends the email by clicking on a button 750 (fig. 7, paragraph [0097]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Rothkop's teaching to Acuri 's system in order to exchange messages among users via Internet.

14. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acuri in view of Panichkul et al'(or hereinafter "Panichkul")(US 6775537) and further in view of Mccotter (US 6401097).

As to claim 13, Acuri does not explicity teach the claimed limitation " a processor programmed for arranging the matter file into a taxonomy based on the metadata of the

matter file". Mccotter teaches arrange the matter file into a taxonomy based on the

metadata of the matter file (fig. 3).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Mccotter's teaching of arrange the matter file into a

taxonomy based on the metadata of the matter file to Acuri 's system in order to

search documents in files of a folder quickly.

15. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Acuri in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter "Panichkul") (US 6775537) and

further in view of Lakis (US 5864865).

As to claim 14, Acuri teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1,

except teaches the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for arranging the matter

file into anontology based on attributes of the matter file". Lakis teaches a hierarchical

parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent

object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The

parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the

parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child

relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a

child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent

object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent

object to Acuri 's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

As to claim 15, Acuri teaches the claimed limitation subject matter in claim 1, except teaches the claimed limitation "a processor programmed for propagating the metadata of each of a plurality of objects into a master folder in a hierarchical manner to simplify moving the objects into the master folder". Lakis teaches a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object (col. 4, lines 17-20; col. 10, lines 35-50).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Lakis's teaching of a hierarchical parent/child relationship with respect to each other, each object being either a parent object to a child object, a child object being either a parent object to a child object. The parent object has attributes; thus a child object inherits attributes information of the parent object to Acuri 's system in order to displaying showing the parent/child hierarchy of the objects, enabling an individual to quickly grasp the relationship any object in a hierarchy with respect to any other object in the hierarchy.

16. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

in view of over Acuri (US 6915299) in view of Panichkul et al (or hereinafter

"Panichkul") (US 6775537) and Hornick (US 20020103689).

        As to claim 16, Acuri teaches the claimed limitations:

"a matter file including a plurality of folders, each folder corresponding to a

document type" as a computer programmed for creating a plurality of document library

file system folders 68.sub.1 -68.sub.M, wherein each document library file system folder

68 is a folder on the file system 36 in which content of a specified type may be read and

saved. The document library file system folder 68 may include subfolders. For

example, one document library file system folder 68 may contain a certain department's

written specifications, another may contain the department's published whitepapers,

another may contain the department's schedules, and so forth. Subfolders may be

present, e.g., the department's schedules may be contained in different subfolders of

the same document library file system folder 68 (fig. 1, col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 1, col. 5,

lines 58-67; col. 6, lines 1-10);

    " the matter file including the plurality of folders" as a computer programmed for

creating a plurality of document library file system folders 68.sub.1 -68.sub.M, wherein

each document library file system folder 68 is a folder on the file system 36 in which

content of a specified type may be read and saved. The document library file system

folder 68 may include subfolders. For example, one document library file system folder

68 may contain a certain department's written specifications, another may contain the

department's published whitepapers, another may contain the department's schedules,

and so forth. Subfolders may be present, e.g., the department's schedules may be

contained in different subfolders of the same document library file system folder 68 (fig.

1, col. 4, lines 23-40; col. 1, col. 5, lines 58-67; col. 6, lines 1-10);

"automatically creating metadata data fields for a new document filed in one of

the plurality of folders in the matter file, the metadata data fields appropriate for the

document type" as a computer programmed for creating properties fields for documents

(figs. 1&3, col. 4, lines 23-40). The properties form 82 includes fields, e.g. the fields 83,

84, 86, each of which represents one of the properties in the property set for the

respective document library. A properties form may be designed so that some property

fields are mandatory (e.g., require data), while others may be optional. The completed

fields define the properties values of the respective document (col. 6, lines 52-65), the

properties fields in form 82 are presented as metadata fields;

"wherein saved queries are associate-able with documents and folders" as as

one query is directed to all documents that stored in folders (fig. 5, col. 9, lines 30-37).

Documents are checked against a query (fig. 10, col. 11, lines 45-67; col. 12, lines 1-

10). The documents are stored in folders (col. 5, lines 53-62). The properties values set

is saved and associated with documents and folders(col. 7, lines 20-40; col. 8, lines 1-

35). The above information shows that queries or the properties values sets are

associated with documents and folders.

Acuri does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation " setting up a matter file in response to a user request; having a plurality of templates, each template designed to set up; saving user-formulated search queries to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and saved queries".

Panichkul teaches "saving user-formulated search queries to said matter file, wherein said saved queries are browse-able and can be re-run at a user's option by selecting a query and wherein saved queries" as storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved query based on user selection (col. 8, lines 15-55).

Hornick teaches "setting up a matter file in response to a user request; having a plurality of templates, each template designed to set up" as library templates, each template designed to set up a file or folder (paragraphs [0106-0107], figs. 9-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hornick's teaching library templates, each template designed to set up a file and Panichkul teaching of storing search queries in a memory and re-runing a saved query based on user selection to Acuri's system in order to a user to create folder structures for association with a deal, a schedule of at least one meeting relating to a deal, and minutes from each meeting in order so that a user can search/retrieve information in folders easily and quickly and to improve the overall quality of search result set, reduce the burden of maintaining and tracking persistent queries, and further increase the overall speed of the search process (col. 4, lines 1-

30).

As to claim 17, Acuri , Panichkul and `Hornick` disclose the claimed limitation

subject matter in claim 16, Hornick further teaches the claimed limitations "the

document inheriting metadata information from the one of the plurality of folders into

which the document is filed" as files contain documents that are inherited metadata from

a folder (paragraphs 0108, 0152).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Hornick's teaching of files contain documents that are

inherited metadata from a folder to Acuri's system in order to include a

robust security structure allowing companies and users on specific deals to be

isolated from other deals, thereby protecting company confidential information

(paragraph 0006).

As to claim 18, Acuri , Panichkul and Hornick disclose the claimed limitation

subject matter in claim 16, Hornick further teaches the claimed limitations teaches the

claimed limitations "wherein the inherited metadata is inferred" as files contain

documents that are inherited metadata from a folder (paragraphs 0108, 0152).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to apply Hornick's teaching of files contain documents that are

inherited metadata from a folder to Acuri's system in order to include a robust security

structure allowing companies and users on specific deals to be isolated from other deals, thereby protecting company confidential information (paragraph 0006).

Conclusion

17.　**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**　Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.　In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action.　In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571)

272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Firday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tony Mahmoudi can be reached on (571) 272-4078. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Cam Y Truong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169